Improving Effectiveness of Performance Appraisal Tool: Who Thinks that It Uses Improved Techniques?

Dr. Vineet Chouhan[1]
Dr. PushpaVerma[2]

Abstract

Business perceptions of the construction industry have changed significantly during the last decades. Due to increasing competition and globalization issues, the parameters of the Human resource evaluation have been enriched by several new concepts. The performance assessment done by objective measures have now been replaced with subjective measures. Internal and external both factors have significant influence on the performance appraisal system (PAS). Therefore it is a matter of concern that how the companies improves their performance appraisal tool for better management of human resources. To achieve the objectives of improving PAS it is essential to communicate the improvement of current PAS to the workers, managers and even to the management. For this purpose current study attempts to know that whether the workers and managers knows that improved technologies have been used under PAS and use of improved techniques dimension influence the PAS and if yes, than who has more clear picture for the use of improved techniques in the organization. These issued were hypothesized in this study that for a mining company to analyze the long-term and short-term strategies adopted by the company, to strengthen the system. To analyze the data multiple regression analysis, ANOVA and Post Hoc test were applied and it can be concluded that, in selected company 2 variables explains the performance appraisal Gap and all the possible pairs of both the variables shown significant difference and less experience managers have shown that the gap in PAS is more in the organization.

Key-words: *Performance Measurement, Strategic Management, Critical Success Factors, Project Performance, Company Performance.*

1. Introduction

Gaining competitive advantage has become one of the major goals for the various companies recently. Accordingly, companies have made several attempts to gain and sustain competitive advantage in the relevant industry all over the world (Porter, 1985; Kaplan and Norton, 1996,

[1] Assistant Professor, Sir Padampat Singhania University, Udaipur, Rajasthan (India), Mob: +91 9772778431, Email: vineet.chouhan@spsu.ac.in.
[2] Lecturer, BNPG Girls College, Udaipur, Rajasthan (India), Mobile:+91 9799297993, Email: pushpa.verma34@gmail.com

Chouhan, 2008) which often resulted in the adoption of new strategies. The main driver behind those strategies was to improve its human performance with an effective PAS for gaining competitive advantage (Kagioglou et al., 2001).

Appraisal of human performance of a company should be managed with its corporate and functional strategies and objectives (Kaplan and Norton, 2005). The main objective of this process is to provide a control system, where the corporate and functional strategies are deployed to its human resources. Thereby, workers finally will check their feedback under the PAS and check the effectiveness of PAS. Therefore, the system of PAS in the organization must be having clear goals, defined system and more importantly, it must be easy, clear and understandable to all the employees. For this purpose the human resource (HR) managers have to update them with the current changes in the PAS of an organization. This is why establishment of a well-managed PAS is a matter of critical importance to the effective and efficient functioning of the Human resources of the company. All employees including temporary employees in any company participate in performance appraisal. Apprentices, trainees and employees who are employed within the framework of "personnel transfers" are appraised according to a different procedure.

The manager who has disciplinary responsibility in the year under review shall carry out the performance appraisal process. If several managers are responsible for a unit, the leading manager may delegate this task to team leaders, for instance, on condition that the employee to be appraised agrees and that the appraisers have participated in a performance appraisal training seminar. The period of appraisal corresponds to the calendar year. Deadlines for completion are published each year. As in any performance appraisal system users emphasize procedural fairness. Because generally everybody gets appraised, but for special conditions special procedures are applied, one could expect that users perceive this system as being procedural fair. But there are always possibilities of unfair justice and hence the system needs to be improved with the new and available methods or new method may be combination of any two or more method. These changes resulted as satisfaction and dis-satisfaction of employees. For any employer it is important to know that whether the workers or managers believe that PAS has been attached with improved techniques or not? And whether the change in managerial experience put difference in PAS?

2. Objectives
The objectives of this paper are as under:
1. To identify the variables which affect the PAS.
2. To measure the perception gap between various categories of managers on selected variables which effect current PAS

3. Literature Review
Ahmed (1999) in his research paper on "The emerging measure of effectiveness for human resource management: An exploratory study with performance appraisal", describes and explores an emerging integrated measure of effectiveness for human resource management functions. The emerging measure basically incorporates both the mission support and employee support goals as two criteria of effectiveness. The paper next analyzes the measures of effectiveness that an agency uses for its performance appraisal function. A questionnaire was sent to 298 members of the professional staff of a large state agency in the mid-west. The objectives were to assess the need and feasibility for the application of this emerging measure of effectiveness. The study found that even though performance appraisal was widely practiced as a mission support function; there was strong support for the use of this integrated

measure of effectiveness. The paper concludes with offering a design for a management development workshop session which focuses on developing a complementary relationship among different personnel functions.

Boland, et. al., (2000) in their research paper on "A systems perspective of performance management in public sector organizations", presents an examination and discussion of performance measurement, performance indicators and associated improvement initiatives from a systemic perspective, as typically applied in public sector organizations. Such mechanisms are usually implemented as a causal loop which is established between perceived performance and resulting actions, thereby constituting a form of feedback control. Within this context a two-dimensional matrix model is postulated in which the independent dimensions are the source of control and the nature of the resultant control-action. The paper examines the implications revealed by this model within the context of performance management and system dynamics. The potential role of influence diagrams and dynamic simulation models is thereby introduced as a potential means of unraveling the complex behaviour which can often arise in the presence of such interactive cause-effect loops. A number of typical examples, drawn from within the public sector, are invoked to illustrate the discussion.

Mike et. al, (2002) in their research paper on "A framework of the factors affecting the evolution of performance measurement systems", raised an issue of the effectiveness of performance measurement as an issue of growing importance to industrialists and academics alike. Many organizations are investing considerable amounts of resource implementing measures that reflect all dimensions of their performance. Consideration is being given to what should be measured today, but little attention is being paid to the question of what should be measured tomorrow. Measurement systems should be dynamic. They have to be modified as circumstances change. Yet few organizations appear to have systematic processes in place for managing the evolution of their measurement systems and few researchers appear to have explored the question, what shapes the evolution of an organization's measurement system? The research reported in this paper seeks to address this gap in the literature by presenting data that describes the forces that shape the evolution of the measurement systems used by different organizations.

Ikemefuna et. al., (2012) in their research paper on "Workers' Perception of Performance Appraisal in Selected Public and Private Organizations in Lagos Metropolis, Nigeria", revealed that workers have an optimistic view of performance appraisal as a means for promoting, evaluating and equitably compensating employees, and forming the basis for many employee training programmes as well as its motivational effect on workers' performance. The authors recommend that for appraisal to yield the desired outcomes, adequate attention should be paid to the avoidance of appraisal politics and the pursuance of fairness and transparency in the process. More so, training programmes could be initiated by organizations to offer tips for avoiding appraisal errors. Open-reporting system as opposed to closed-reporting system should be encouraged for performance appraisal to have a motivational effect on workers' performance.

Manikutty (1990) in his article in "PAS in the Railway Staff College" stated that Performance Appraisal in organizations can serve three purpose viz. a control device; Pricing mechanism; a mechanism for development of human resources. He has enumerated different dimensions of Performance Appraisal viz. periodicity of assessment; Degree of Secrecy; Parameters assessed and studies consequences of the choice along the maintained dimensions. He suggested

frequented appraisal so that corrective actions can be taken early and also gauzed the effects of variation in periodicity of Assessment, furthering he said, "there must not be a Performance Appraisal system rather a Potential appraisal system should exist. He had also mopped up the linkages of the performance per se of employees in the last period, traits and abilities of the employees with the purpose of a Performance Appraisal System.

Gundrsen, D. E. (1993) in his research article, "An article assessment of the influences of performance and selected non-performance factors on performance evaluation and accuracy" discussed that the appraisal of employee effectiveness is one of the most important managerial tasks carried out in organizations. Ideally, performance evaluations should reflect the performance levels of represented employees. Unfortunately, a variety of factors other than performance have the potential to influence appraisal efforts which may cause biased performance evaluations. It biased evaluations occur, the resulting appraisal accuracy is likely to be impaired and the benefits associated with an effective performance appraisal process may not be realized. Results indicate that rater's performance is by far the most influential variable in explaining variance for performance evaluations. To the contrary, rater's performance was not found to be significant in explaining variance for the accuracy criteria. Impression management was found to be significant for both the criterion variables. Results indicate that when a defensive impression management is displayed by ratee's, evaluations are lower and accuracy is damaged compared to other impression management conditions. Impression management was also found to interact significantly with a number of other variables in explaining variance for both performance evaluations and accuracy, most of the variance explained in this study is the result of ratee's performance and impression management. Consequently, the significant interaction effects consistently involve either one or both of these variables.

Jackson, Peter M., (1993) revealed that Performance evaluation of government activities is essential in any democracy. Government, no matter the level (central/federal, state, or local), should be accountable and responsible to the electorate and a host of other stakeholders. Accountability involves, among other things, an assessment of policy outcomes, along with the means and processes used to deliver the policies. Were the policies suitable for the problems that the electorate wanted to be solved? Were the policies implemented efficiently and effectively? Did the electorate, taxpayers, and users of public services (often these aw distinct groups) obtain value for money?

Robert's Gary E (1995) in his article, "Municipal Government PAS Practices: Is the whole less than the sum of its parts," revealed that one of the most controversial techniques in the manager "tool box" for increasing work place productivity is PA. Municipal Government, like many other organization, are striving to develop an effective AS. One strategy for evaluating the effectiveness of Municipal Government PAS is to analyze the individual components and attributes that constitute a PAS. He describes three main objectives in his study first; Municipal Government PAS is designed in accordance with the research literature second, to measure perceptions of how well the individual components of the PAS are working and third, to gauge perceptions on the overall effectiveness of PAS. The survey demonstrates that there is room for optimism on the quality and effectiveness of the PA process.

Clinton O. Longencker Nick Nykodym (1996) article, "Public Sector Performance effectiveness: A case study" explore the potential benefits and problems associated with PA in the public sector. Public sectors PA are a significant aspect of making employees more

productive and are the "tool of choice" in such performance enhancing efforts. It has been said that "anything worth doing is worth doing well" Given the goal of most AS to be quite appropriate. Other elements such as 'managers' and 'subordinates' attitude towards PA and expectations also play a significant role in achieving effectiveness of PA. This study should serve as a case study for organization to assess the effectiveness of their AS.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
The main purpose of this paper is to broaden the understanding about the PAS in government sector undertaking in respect of use of good/ improved techniques.

4.1. Selected Company
Company selected for research paper is The Rajasthan State Mines & Minerals Limited (RSMML) which is one of the largest and most successful mining companies in India and proud to support four key areas in the economic development of country namely; Agriculture, Steel, Construction and Power. It is the only producer of high grade rock phosphate in the country. RSMML today comprises of five separate divisions, each working autonomously under the overall control of the corporate office at Udaipur.

4.2. Research Design
The research design used by the researcher is in accordance with the empirical study requirements. Since the company has introduces the new improved method of Performance Appraisal the management wished to analyse that whether the new system has increased the effectiveness this study has been conducted. Research design, as such, covers the type of data collected, the methodology of data collection and the various statistical tools and techniques used for analysis of data and hypotheses - testing. Being empirical study, it is completely based on primary data

4.3. Data Collection
For the purpose of the current studies the Primary data is collected through questionnaire that is to be filled up by the workers and Managers of the selected organizations. While the Secondary data is collected from the RSMML website www.rsmm.com

4.4. Variables
With the above review of literature a few key areas which are required to measure the use of good/ improved techniques is been selected for the purpose of current research paper there are 5 variables selected which is shown in table no 1.

Table 1: Description of variables

Variables	Description of variables
VAR0001	Good scales are used to evaluate performance.
VAR0002	Accurate assessment of different dimensions of performance is allowed.
VAR0003	The existing form is too complex.
VAR0004	The existing form is too long.
VAR0005	The existing form is easy to use.

For the purpose of identifying the gap in performance appraisal system the first step is the identification of variables which influence the PAS. For this purpose the following hypothesis is being developed:

4.5. Hypothesised Relationship and Findings
4.5.1. Hypothesis – 1
H_1: The attributes/constructs configuring Performance appraisal of organisation on use of improved techniques dimension significantly influence the PAS.

To analyse the above hypothesis SPSS-19 software is being used and multiple regression technique is used as a tool for analysis. The result of this analysis is shown in table-2.

Table-2: Multivariate Regression Analysis of use of good/ improved techniques
Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Current PA System	3.0909	.91575	99
VAR0001	3.7980	.62237	99
VAR0002	3.7374	.81549	99
VAR0003	2.8384	.79163	99
VAR0004	2.9293	.86014	99
VAR0005	3.3838	.85365	99

Correlations

		Current PA System	VAR00037	VAR00038	VAR00039	VAR00040	VAR00041
Pearson Correlation	Current PAS	1.000					
	VAR0001	.033	1.000				
	VAR0002	.142	.518	1.000			
	VAR0003	-.317	.285	.060	1.000		
	VAR0004	-.095	.259	.191	.717	1.000	
	VAR0005	.164	.378	.058	.319	.260	1.000

Variables Entered/Removed[a]

Model	Variables Entered	Variables Removed	Method
1	VAR0003	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).
2	VAR0005	.	Stepwise (Criteria: Probability-of-F-to-enter <= .050, Probability-of-F-to-remove >= .100).

a. Dependent Variable: Current PA System

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.317[a]	.101	.091	.87287	.101	10.863	1	97	.001
2	.423[b]	.179	.162	.83838	.078	9.147	1	96	.003

a. Predictors: (Constant), VAR0003
b. Predictors: (Constant), VAR0003, VAR0005

ANOVA[c]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	8.277	1	8.277	10.863	.001[a]
	Residual	73.905	97	.762		
	Total	82.182	98			
2	Regression	14.706	2	7.353	10.461	.000[b]
	Residual	67.476	96	.703		
	Total	82.182	98			

a. Predictors: (Constant), VAR0003
b. Predictors: (Constant), VAR0003, VAR0005
c. Dependent Variable: Current PA System

Coefficients[a]

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	Correlations Zeroorder	Partial	Part	Collinearity Statistics Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	4.133	.328		12.597	.000					
VAR0003	-.367	.111	-.317	-3.296	.001	-.317	-.317	-.317	1.000	1.000
(Constant)	3.371	.403		8.355	.000					
VAR0003	-.476	.113	-.412	-4.217	.000	-.317	-.395	-.390	.898	1.113
VAR0005	.317	.105	.295	3.024	.003	.164	.295	.280	.898	1.113

a. Dependent Variable: Current PA System

Assessing Overall Model Fit
The final Regressionmodel with 2 independent variables (VAR0003 & VAR0005) explains almost 16.2% of the variance of current PAS.Also, the standard errors of the estimate has been reduced to 0.83838, which means that at 95% level, the margin of errors for any predicted value of Current PAS can be calculated as ± 1.643225(1.96 X 0.83838).The impact of multicolinerarity in the 2 variables is substantial. They all have the tolerance value less than .898, indicating that only over 11 % of the variance is accounted for by the other variables in the equation.

ANOVA Analysis
The ANOVA analysis provides the statistical test for overall model fit in terms of F Ratio. The total sum of squares (82.182) is the squared error that would accrue if the mean of Current PAS has been used to predict the dependent variable. Using the values of VAR0003& VAR0005 this error can be reduced by 17.8944% (14.706/82.182). This reduction is deemed statistically significant with the F ratio of 10.461 and significance at level of 0.000.With the above analysis it can be conclude that 2 variables i.e., VAR0003 & VAR0005 explains the use of good/ improved techniques as Performance appraisal tools.

For the purpose of identifying the gap as per managerial experience in the performance appraisal system in the second step by taking theidentified variables following hypothesis is being developed:

4.5.2. Hypothesis – 2
H_2: The perception pertaining to existing PAS remains unaffected with the change in managerial experience.

To analyse the above hypothesis SPSS-19 software is being used and ANOVA and Multiple Comparisons: Tukey HSD Post Hoc technique is used as a tool for analysis. The result of this analysis is shown in table-3.

Table 3: Analysis of Variance on Use of Improved techniques Dimension
Descriptive

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval for Mean Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Minimum	Maximum
VAR0003	1.00	21	2.9048	.94365	.20592	2.4752	3.3343	1.00	4.00
	2.00	16	2.9375	.57373	.14343	2.6318	3.2432	2.00	4.00
	3.00	62	2.7903	.79211	.10060	2.5892	2.9915	1.00	4.00
	Total	99	2.8384	.79163	.07956	2.6805	2.9963	1.00	4.00
VAR0005	1.00	21	3.7143	1.0556	.23035	3.2338	4.1948	2.00	5.00
	2.00	16	2.9375	.57373	.14343	2.6318	3.2432	2.00	4.00
	3.00	62	3.3871	.79661	.10117	3.1848	3.5894	2.00	5.00
	Total	99	3.3838	.85365	.08579	3.2136	3.55	2.00	5.00

ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
VAR0003	Between Groups	.393	2	.196	.309	.735
	Within Groups	61.021	96	.636		
	Total	61.414	98			
VAR0005	Between Groups	5.481	2	2.741	3.990	.022
	Within Groups	65.933	96	.687		
	Total	71.414	98			

The ANOVA is applied at on the responses of the managers to measure the group difference. The group difference on variables (F_{v0003}=0.309, p_{v0003}= 0.735>0.05) is not statistically significant at 5% level of significance. However, a significant group difference exists on the variables which include (F_{v0005}=3.990, p_{v0005}= 0.022<0.05). This test is further supported by Tukey Post Hoc in order to perform multiple comparisons between all the possible pairs of selected variables. Thus, ANOVA Post Hoc Tukey HDS test has been applied to test the hypothesis.

Table –4:   Tukey Post Hoc Test on Use of Good/ Improved techniques
Multiple Comparisons: Tukey HSD

Dependent Variable	(I) Experience	(J) Experience	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	Upper Bound
VAR0003	1.00	2.00	-.03274	.26457	.992	-.6626	.5971
		3.00	.11444	.20130	.837	-.3648	.5936
	2.00	1.00	.03274	.26457	.992	-.5971	.6626
		3.00	.14718	.22356	.788	-.3850	.6794
	3.00	1.00	-.11444	.20130	.837	-.5936	.3648
		2.00	-.14718	.22356	.788	-.6794	.3850
VAR0005	1.00	2.00	.77679*	.27501	.016	.1221	1.4315
		3.00	.32719	.20924	.266	-.1709	.8253
	2.00	1.00	-.77679*	.27501	.016	-1.4315	-.1221
		3.00	-.44960	.23238	.135	-1.0028	.1036
	3.00	1.00	-.32719	.20924	.266	-.8253	.1709
		2.00	.44960	.23238	.135	-.1036	1.0028

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

VAR0003
TukeyHSD[a,b]

Experience	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05 1
3.00	62	2.7903
1.00	21	2.9048
2.00	16	2.9375
Sig.		.800

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.
a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 23.763.
b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

VAR0005
TukeyHSD[a,b]

Experience	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05 1	2
2.00	16	2.9375	
3.00	62	3.3871	3.3871
1.00	21		3.7143
Sig.		.153	.365

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.
a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 23.763.
b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used. Type I error levels are not guaranteed.

The multiple comparison on variables (VAR0005, $p_{1,2}= 0.016 < 0.05$) shows that a significant group difference exists on the above variables while the other possible pair shows no significant difference between the pairs.

5. Conclusion

Appraisal of performance of human resources is a very difficult task and calculating the differences between workers and managers are matter of greater concern for the employer since it affects the motivation level of the employees. In both the cases the null hypothesis were rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted. The study unrevealed the fact that 2 variables i.e., the existing form is too complex (VAR0003) &the existing form is easy to use (VAR0005)explains the use of good/ improved techniques as Performance appraisal tools. When the same is further analysed to identify that whether there is any gap in the managers view on the basis of their experience category the multiple comparison on above selected variables (VAR0005, $p_{1,2}= 0.016 < 0.05$) shows that a significant group difference exists on the variable "The existing form is easy to use" while the other possible pair shows no significant difference between the pairs. The mean of less experienced managers are more which shows that less experience managers think that there is a significant gap in the PAS.

References

[1] Ahmed, Shamima, (1999), "The emerging measure of effectiveness for human resource management: An exploratory study with performance appraisal", Journal of Management Development, Vol. 18, Issue 6, Pp.543 – 556.

[2] Boland, Tony, Alan Fowler, (2000),"A systems perspective of performance management in public sector organisations", International Journal of Public Sector Management, Vol. 13 Iss. 5, Pp.417 – 446.

[3] Ikemefuna, Cyril Oseloka, ChristopherOdogwuChidi, (2012), "Workers' Perception of Performance Appraisal in Selected Public and Private Organizations in Lagos Metropolis", Nigeria, International Journal of Human Resource, Vol. 2, No.3, Pp 212.

[4] Mike, Kennerley, Andy Neely (2002), "A framework of the factors affecting the evolution of performance measurement systems", International Journal of Operations & Production Management, vol. 22 issue: 11, Pp.1222 – 1245

[5] Manikutty; (1990), "performance measurement systems", Journal of the Railway Staff College, July- September, Pp23-33.

[6] Gundrsen, David Eric, (1993), "An article assessment of the influences of performance and selected non-performance factors on performance evaluation and accuracy." Dissertation Abstracts International, Vol. 53, No.9, March, Pp3282-A.

[7] Clinton O. Longencker, Nick Nykodyan (1996), "Public Sector Performance effectiveness; A case study". Public Personnel Management, Vol. 25, No 2, summer, pp 151-163.

[8] Jackson, Peter M., (1993) Public service performance evaluation: A strategic perspective, Public Money & Management, Vol.13, Iss. 4, Pp 89-105.

[9] Robert, Gary E (1995) "Municipal Govt. Performance Appraisal System Practices: Is the whole less than the sum of its parts." Public Personnel Management, Vol 24, No. 2, summer, Pp 197-221.

[10] Verma, P. and Chouhan, V., (2014), "Measuring validity of performance appraisal tools in Performance Appraisal System" Nirnay the Journal of Decision Science, Vol. 6, No. 1, Jan-July, Pp 57-64.

[11] Chouhan, V. Verma, Pushpa, Sanghvi, Himanshu and Gupta, Apurv (2013), "Assessing Worker's and Manager's Perception on Judgment Accuracy in Performance Appraisal

System (PAS)" by International Journal of Engineering, Business and Enterprise Applications (IJEBEA), Vol. 5, No. 1, June-August, 2013, Pp. 95-99.

[12] Porter, M. (1985), "Competitive advantages",New York: The Pre-Press.

[13] Chouhan, V.,(2008),"Don't forget ABC: Work is not Completed", by Pacific Business Review, July-Sep, Vol 1, Issue 2, Pp 77-81.

[14] Kaplan, R. S. and Norton, D. P. (1996). "Using the balanced scorecard as a strategic management system", Harvard Business Review, Vol.74, No. 1, Pp75–85.

[15] Kagioglou, M., Cooper, R. and Aouad, G. (2001). "Performance management in construction: A conceptual framework", Construction Management and Economics, Vol.9, No 1, Pp 85–95.

[16] Kaplan, R. S. and Norton, D. P. (2005). "The Office of Strategy Management" Harvard Business Review, online from http://hbr.org/2005/10/the-office-of-strategy-management/ar/1.

[17] Schalkwyk, J. C. (1998). "Total quality management and performance measurement barrier." The TQM Magazine, Vol. 10, No.2, Pp 124-31.

1.
Questionnaire

(A) PERSONAL INFORMATION

Name: ………………………………………………

Category: Employee ☐   Manager ☐

Gender: Male/Female   Age:..…………………………

Experience: Most Experienced (>15) ☐   Moderate (5-15) ☐

Less Experienced (<5) ☐

Educational Qualification……………………………..………….

(B) Are you satisfied with the current performance system?

(Please Tick [√] the appropriate box)

Extremely Dissatisfied ☐   Dissatisfied ☐   No opinion ☐   Satisfied ☐   Extremely Satisfied ☐

(C) Do you satisfied with the use of improved techniques in current performance system?

 (Please Tick [√] the appropriate box)

Extremely Dissatisfied ☐   Dissatisfied ☐   No opinion ☐   Satisfied ☐   Extremely Satisfied ☐

(D) Please Display your degree of agreement/disagreement about current performance appraisal system.   Please Tick [√] the appropriate Box

S. No.	Questions	Least Important	Less Important	No opinion	Impo-rtant	Highly Impor-tant
		1	2	3	4	5
1	Good scales are used to evaluate performance.					
2	Accurate assessment of different dimensions of performance is allowed.					
3	The existing form is too complex.					
4	The existing form is too long.					
5	The existing form is easy to use.					